

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15-22, and 24-26 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 12-13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0128920 to Chopra ("Chopra"). Chopra relates to a method and system for providing products and/or services to consumers from one or more sources or vendors. Applicant respectfully submits that Chopra fails to teach, anticipate, or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 12, namely, at least one processor executing a stored interactive software application inside a browser on a client computing system, the executed interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system.

Chopra discloses a method and system for facilitating lowest cost purchasing of products and/or services. The system includes a computer system configured to receive an order from a customer for a plurality of products or services. The computer system receives the order and electronically searches for prices for each of the products and/or services in the order. The computer system then groups the products and/or services into one or more groups and determines one or more sources or vendors that can provide the one or more groups at a lowest purchase cost.

In contrast to claim 12, there is no teaching or suggestion by Chopra of executing a stored interactive software application inside a browser on a client computing system, the executed interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system. Chopra discloses a computing device loaded with software configured for

generating order information from customers or downloading an order entry application from a lowest purchase cost server to computing device to facilitate an order entry process. If an application is downloaded from the lowest purchase cost server, the computing device will include a browser or other suitable program for running the downloaded application. The lowest purchase cost server is configured to receive products or service orders from computing devices and search sources and/or vendors to find the lowest costs for products.

According to Chopra, after the lowest purchase cost server obtains an appropriate product and price information, the lowest purchase cost server provides the product and price information to the consumer. Chopra discloses running applications between consumers, the lowest purchase cost server, and the vendors via a communication connection but fails to disclose running applications between consumers on the consumer side of the system. More specifically, Chopra fails to disclose executing a stored interactive software application inside a browser on a client computing system and communicating with at least one element outside the browser operating on the client computing system, the at least one element being a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system claim 12. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 12 distinguishes over Chopra and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 12 as anticipated by Chopra is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 13 and 15 depend from and further restrict independent claim 12 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 12, dependent claims 13 and 15 distinguish over Chopra and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 13 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-22 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chopra in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0169980 to Brownell ("Brownell").

Claims 16-18 depend from and further restrict independent claim 12 in a patentable sense. In rejecting claims 16-18, the Examiner has further applied Brownell. Brownell discloses

a method and apparatus for managing network access to internal hosts protected by a firewall. Applicant respectfully submits that Brownell fails to cure the deficiencies of Chopra noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 12, dependent claims 16-18 distinguish over the cited combination of Chopra and Brownell and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 16-18 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 19 relates to a method for providing security to a client computing system operating an interactive software application. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra and Brownell fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 19, namely, communicating data between at least one element and a browser on the client computing system, wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system.

Brownell discloses a method and apparatus for managing network access to internal hosts protected by a firewall. A user on an external host logs into a firewall. Once the user has been authenticated to the firewall, a session is established for the user and tunnel data configuration data is transmitted to the user on the external host.

In contrast to claim 19, Chopra discloses a computing device loaded with software configured for generating order information from customers or downloading an order entry application from a lowest purchase cost server to computing device to facilitate an order entry process. If an application is downloaded from the lowest purchase cost server, the computing device will include a browser or other suitable program for running the downloaded application. The lowest purchase cost server is configured to receive products or service orders from computing devices and search sources and/or vendors to find the lowest costs for products. According to Chopra, after the lowest purchase cost server obtains an appropriate product and price information, the lowest purchase cost server provides the product and price information to the consumer. Chopra discloses running applications between consumers, the lowest purchase cost server, and the vendors via a communication connection but fails to disclose running

applications between consumers on the consumer side of the system. More specifically, Chopra fails to disclose communicating data between at least one element and a browser on the client computing system, the at least one element being outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system as claimed. Brownell fails to remedy the deficiencies of Chopra disclosed above. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 19 distinguishes over the combination of Chopra and Brownell and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 depend from and further restrict independent claim 19 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 19, dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 distinguish over the cited combination of Chopra and Brownell and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chopra in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0035450 to Thackston ("Thackston").

Independent claim 1 discloses a method for providing security to a client computing system in communication with a host communication system across a network. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra and Thackston fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 1, namely, executing an interactive software application in a browser on a client computing system, the interactive software application being in communication with at least one element on a client side of a client side firewall, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system.

Chopra discloses a computing device loaded with software configured for generating order information from customers or downloading an order entry application from a lowest

purchase cost server to computing device to facilitate an order entry process. If an application is downloaded from the lowest purchase cost server, the computing device will include a browser or other suitable program for running the downloaded application. The lowest purchase cost server is configured to receive products or service orders from computing devices and search sources and/or vendors to find the lowest costs for products.

According to Chopra, after the lowest purchase cost server obtains an appropriate product and price information, the lowest purchase cost server provides the product and price information to the consumer. Chopra discloses running applications between consumers, the lowest purchase cost server, and the vendors via a communication connection but fails to disclose running applications between consumers on the consumer side of the system. More specifically, Chopra fails to disclose executing a stored interactive software application inside a browser on a client computing system and communicating with at least one element outside the browser operating on the client computing system, the at least one element being a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system. Thackston fails to remedy the deficiencies of Chopra disclosed above. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 distinguishes over the combination of Chopra and Thackston and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-11 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-11 distinguish over the cited combination of Chopra and Thackston and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-11 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 26 relates to a system for providing security to a client computing system in communication with a host in communication with a host communication system across a network. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra and Thackston fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 26, namely, means for executing an interactive software application in a browser on a client computing system, the interactive software application being in

communication with at least one element on the client side of a client side firewall, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system.

Additionally, Applicant submits that claim 26 patentably distinguishes over Chopra and Thackston for similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 12, and 19.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Dated: Sept 20, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Stanley R. Moore

Registration No.: 26,958
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 855-4500
Attorneys For Applicant